

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin will state his point of order.

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman is not discussing the matter at hand.

The CHAIRMAN. Once again, the gentleman from Wisconsin is correct. The gentleman from Texas must confine his remarks to the pending question.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Well, I need an answer to this question, and I am at a loss about how to get that answer.

I listened to my chairman explain his position. I would hope that we could give him a chance to respond to a few simple questions about what he just told the body.

So my question is, did we get the bill within 36 hours?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, point of order. The gentleman can raise any question he wants with the gentleman from Michigan but not on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is correct. The gentleman from Texas must confine his remarks to the pending question.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Is it within the rules of the bill that is under consideration now to go back and ask that previous comments be read to the body to see if they were germane to the pending question? Is that within the rules?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in order.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. That is not in order or it is in order?

The CHAIRMAN. A Member wishing to address the propriety of those remarks must have been timely. The gentleman's present request would not be timely.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. How much time do I have left, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my distinguished chairman, who is the dean of the House, who has served in this body over 50 years, who will go down in its history as one of the most effective Members of the entire 200-plus years of the Congress, if the current process that we are apparently going to use on the SCHIP bill once we get through the Agriculture appropriation bill—

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, point of order. This is not a matter pertaining to the subject at hand.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. With all due respect, I think that does pertain to the subject at hand.

□ 1800

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin have a point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I do. The gentleman is not addressing the matter at hand. This is not the United States Senate where anything is possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman from Texas must confine his remarks to the pending question.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I would like to yield to my distinguished chairman for any remarks he cares to make. How are the Tigers doing in the American League? What are his plans for the August break? If we can't talk about substantive issues because the majority is embarrassed to hear the answer, maybe we can discuss something else.

Mr. OBEY. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. OBEY. Perhaps the gentleman can tell us what the name of the Secretary of Agriculture is. That would at least get us close at hand to the subject we are supposed to be debating.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Well, it's not DAVID OBEY.

I am going to yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman, out of respect for the chairman's courtesies.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I do want to speak in favor of the McHenry amendment. I think it is a vitally important amendment that we debate on this House floor today. Maybe the dollar amount is modest; the principle is huge. This is a body that spends too much of the people's money, and it has repercussions. And no matter how intensely our friends from the other side of the aisle want to prevent us from painting a picture for the American people on where their spending is leading, we feel compelled to speak out.

Mr. Chairman, already this body is spending over \$23,000 per American household. In real terms, it's one of the greatest amounts since World War II. Every appropriations bill that has come to the floor, practically every single one is spending more money than last year, way beyond the rate of inflation and beyond the ability of the family budget to pay for the excess in the Federal budget.

So, now we have an Agriculture appropriations bill which is almost 6 percent above last year. I assure you, the American people didn't get a 6 percent raise, those who are expected to pay for it. And beyond the 6 percent increase, the bill expands mandatory spending. Now, supposedly PAYGO is supposed to apply to this, but it doesn't because we have a PAYGO loophole. And this is a big, big loophole, Mr. Chairman. And we need to pay attention to more man-

datory spending. Because already, simply with the government that we have today, before our friends on the other side of the aisle add on a massive increase in an SCHIP program that's going to be funded with tax increases and Medicare cuts, before they do that, we're already on automatic pilot to double taxes on the next generation. We're either going to double taxes on the next generation or there is not going to be any Federal Government to speak of, except Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. There will barely be any funds for anything else.

And don't take my word for it, Madam Chair, take the word of the Office of Management and Budget, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, the conservative Heritage Foundation, the liberal Brookings Institute. So there is this train wreck coming on entitlement spending.

We have a modest amendment that would reduce a little bit of spending in the Agriculture bill to take off that pressure, and instead the amendment is simply mocked. Well, we can't do that because we know if we don't pass this amendment, this modest amendment, to save money on the Agriculture appropriations bill, we know what it's leading to on SCHIP, a new permanent entitlement of almost \$160 billion over 10 years. I mean, Madam Chair, this is unconscionable, unconscionable on top of the burden that is already going to be placed upon future taxpayers.

Now, we have so many Members who come to the floor and talk about, well, we have to be here for the least of these. Well, Madam Chair, I would posit that maybe the least of these are those who do not vote and those who have yet to be born. And so that is why we need the amendment passed by the gentleman from North Carolina to save this money, to take pressure off of creating this new huge permanent entitlement in SCHIP.

We also need this amendment in this Ag bill to take the pressure off this huge cut in Medicare that the Democrat majority is now planning, as they seek to pit grandparents against their grandchildren in this massive SCHIP tax-spend-debt spiral. I mean, they're going to increase taxes, the tobacco taxes. I'm not a smoker. I used to be a volunteer in the American Cancer Society, but last I looked, it's still a legal activity. So taxes are going to fall on low- and moderate-income Americans as they seek to take away private insurance from others and put them onto a public insurance plan.

We're looking again at cutting Medicare Advantage plans, almost 20 percent of the people. We're going to have pressure to cut Medicare.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Is the gentleman aware that we've accepted the amendment?

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, do I control the time? If so, I have not yielded to the gentleman from Illinois.